

1
2
3 STEVEN L. LOMBARDO, et al.,
4 Plaintiffs,
5 v.
6 MERCANTILE RESOURCE GROUP, INC,
7 et al.,
8 Defendants.

9 Case No. 20-cv-02153-BLF
10
11

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
ENFORCE JUDGMENT; AND
STAYING ENFORCEMENT OF
JUDGMENT UNDER RULE 62(H)**

12
13 Before the Court is Plaintiffs' motion to enforce the judgment previously entered by this
14 Court. *See Mot.*, ECF 71. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-1(b), the Court finds that this motion is
15 appropriate for determination without oral argument, and the July 1, 2021 hearing is VACATED.
16 The motion is DENIED.

17 When the Court entered its judgment on October 26, 2020, (ECF 64) default judgment had
18 been entered against all three Defendants. *See Order*, ECF 56. However, the day after Plaintiffs
19 filed this motion, the Court granted Defendant David Sanchez's motion to vacate the default
20 judgment entered against him, finding that he had demonstrated good cause under Rule 60(b). *See*
21 Order Granting Mot. to Vacate, ECF 73. Plaintiffs only sought injunctive relief, and the judgment
22 requires all three Defendants to deliver certain personal property to Plaintiffs, including 82 income
23 and mortgage bonds. *See Judgment 2*, ECF 64. However, Plaintiffs concede that Defendant
24 Sanchez is co-owner of the bonds. *See Mot. 2*. Since Defendant Sanchez is no longer subject to the
25 judgment entered by this Court, the Court could not order enforcement of the judgment without
26 prejudice to Defendant Sanchez.

27 "Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62(h) provides that when a court has entered final
28 judgment, it may upon its discretion, 'stay enforcement of that judgment until the entering of a

1 subsequent judgment or judgments.' *AmerisourceBergen Corp. v. Dialysist W., Inc.*, 465 F.3d 946,
2 955 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 62(h)). "In fashioning a stay of enforcement, a court
3 looks to general equitable principles." *AmerisourceBergen Corp.*, 465 F.3d at 956 (quoting
4 *Pereira v. Cogan*, 275 B.R. 472, 475 (S.D.N.Y. 2002). The Court finds that it would be prejudicial
5 to Defendant Sanchez to enforce the judgment and deprive him of his property without first
6 allowing him to litigate the merits of this case. Similarly, the Court does not find that Plaintiffs
7 will be prejudiced by litigating the merits of this case. Using its discretion, the Court DENIES
8 Plaintiffs' motion and will STAY enforcement of the judgment entered on October 26, 2020, until
9 this case is fully resolved.¹

10

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12

13 Dated: April 1, 2021



14

15 BETH LABSON FREEMAN
16 United States District Judge

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 ¹ The Court notes that Defendant Sanchez incorrectly believes that Defendants Mercantile
27 Resource Group, Inc., and Choctaw Indian Asset Recovery Trust, of which he is a trustee, are not
28 subject to the judgment entered by this Court. See Opp'n ¶ 3, ECF 78. The Court's judgment
clearly indicates that it is against "Mercantile Resource Group, Inc., and Choctaw Indian Asset
Recovery Trust dba Choctaw Management Group." Judgment 1. Defendant Sanchez is encouraged
to correct this misconception if his fellow Defendants share it.